

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figure 9. The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figures 8 and 9, replaces the original sheet including Figures 8 and 9.

Please add the term "PRIOR ART" to Figure 9.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-5 have been amended. Claim 6 is new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

### **DRAWINGS**

Figure 9 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. Figure 9 has been amended to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claims 4 and 5 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 2 has been amended to overcome the rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, (as best can be understood in view of the indefiniteness of Claim 2) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 10-236132 (made of record via IDS). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. JP 10-236132 illustrates a door 50 having a door shaft 51 with an elastic packing member 52 and 52 attached to the door. As best illustrated in Figures 1, 2(b) and 4, the elastic packing members cover only the door as their top end terminates at the point where the door 50 meets the shaft 51. The elastic packing members do not cover the door shaft 51 for reducing a clearance between the door shaft and the bearing hole as defined by original Claim 1.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to more clearly define this feature. Claim 1, as amended, defines an elastic packing member disposed between the door shaft and the bearing hole. JP 10-236132 does not disclose the elastic packing member between shaft 51 and the hole in casing 4.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2 and 3, which depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Alternately for Claims 1-3 (as best can be understood in view of the indefiniteness of Claim 2) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoffman, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Hoffman, et al. discloses a door 40 having a door shaft 48 with a portion of an elastic packing member 53 attached to the door and a portion 51 covering a portion of the door shaft. The elastic packing member 53 or 51 do not reduce clearance between the door shaft and a

bearing hole. Hoffman, et al. does not disclose a casing with a bearing hole for the door shaft. Hoffman discloses a case having a nose portion that extends into a central bore of shaft 48.

As discussed above, Claim 1 has been amended to define the elastic packing member as being disposed between the door shaft and the bearing hole in the casing.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2 and 3, which depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **NEW CLAIM**

New Claim 6 is a dependent claim that Applicant believes properly further limits Claim 1. Applicant believes Claim 6 reads on the elected species.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 3, 2007

By:

  
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg